

Appl. No. 10/071,816  
Amdt. Dated October 18, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 17, 2004

Remarks & Arguments

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1-4, 7, 17-20 and 24-33 are pending in the application, and that Claims 1-4, 7, 17-20 and 24-33 are rejected. By this amendment, Claims 1, 17 and 19 have been amended and Claims 7 and 24 have been canceled without prejudice. Thus, Claims 1-4 and 17-20 are pending in the application. The amendments to the claims do not add new matter to the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

*Objection to Drawings*

The objection to the drawings have been rendered moot in light of cancellation of Claims 25-33.

*Rejection Under 35 USC 112, First Paragraph*

The rejection of Claims 25-33 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, has been rendered moot in light of the cancellation of Claims 25-33.

*Rejections Under 35 USC 102 and 103*

Claims 1-4 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Heikkinen et al. (USPN: 6,073,036). Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to include the limitations of Claims 7 and 24. The rejection alleges that Heikkinen discloses scrolling a display area of the touchscreen until the desired character to be input is reached. The rejection alleges

Appl. No. 10/071,816  
Amdt. Dated October 18, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 17, 2004

that “this implies the magnification area reaching an edge of the touchscreen.” The Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection incorrectly associates the “scrolling of the magnified area within the display area of the touchscreen” with “scrolling a display area of the touchscreen when the fly over area reaches an edge of the touchscreen”. Heikkinen discloses that a given display area of the touchscreen is fixed. The magnified area of Heikkinen can scroll within the display area of the touchscreen. However, Heikkinen clearly does not teach or suggest that when the magnification area reaches an edge of the touchscreen that the display area is scrolled. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 17 as amended are patentable over Heikkinen. Claims 2-4 and 18-20 are dependent upon independent Claims 1 and 17, respectively, and incorporate all the limitations therein. Therefore, Claims 2-4 and 18-20 are patentable over Heikkinen for the same reason advanced in support of Claims 1 and 17. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Conclusion

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 23-0085. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a

Appl. No. 10/071,816  
Amdt. Dated October 18, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 17, 2004

petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: October 18, 2004



Eric J. Gash  
Registration No. 46,274  
Tel.: (408) 938-9060